UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/708,109	11/03/2000	Scott Nedderman	17200-074US1	9251

54205   7590   09/18/2008
CHADBOURNE & PARKE LLP
30 ROCKEFELLER PLAZA
NEW YORK, NY 10112

EXAMINER
KANG, INSUN

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2193	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
09/18/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>28 July 2008</u>.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL.**   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-92</u> is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-92</u> is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   This action is in response to the RCE amendment filed on 7/28/2008.

2.   Claims 1-92 are pending.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

4.   Claims 1-92 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lee

et al. (US Patent 6,535,883) herein after referred to as "Lee" in view of Nugent

("Addressing For Field Validation with regular Expressions and JavaScript 1.2,"

11/1997), and further in view of Brooke et al. (US Patent 6,748,569) hereafter Brooke.

Per claim 1:

Lee discloses:

-receiving information over a communications network ("server computer…confirming

data input by a user of the mobile computer," col. 4 lines 5-25).

        Lee does not explicitly teach identifying a retriever's input analysis capability.

Nugent teaches it was known in the pertinent art, at the time applicant's invention was

made, to detect the browser compatibility (i.e. JavaScript 1.2 supports regular expression

and provides common object detection routines such as window.RegExp that detects the

browser compatibility). It would have been obvious for one having ordinary skill in the

art to modify Lee's disclosed system to incorporate the teachings of Nugent. The

modification would be obvious because one having ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to identify the retriever's browser compatibility.

Lee further discloses retrieving customizable validation rules appropriate for a retriever's capabilities (i.e. col. 3 lines 19-40; col. 4 lines 27-41). Lee does not explicitly teach retrieving customizable inheritable validation rules appropriate for a retriever's input analysis capabilities from a hereditary rules library. Brooke teaches it was known in the pertinent art, at the time applicant's invention was made, to extend and reuse the validation rules (i.e. col. 13 lines 15-25). It would have been obvious for one having ordinary skill in the art to modify Lee's disclosed system to incorporate the teachings of Brooke. The modification would be obvious because one having ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to reuse validation logic with very little code by using inheritance as taught by Brooke.

Lee in view of Nugent and Brooke further discloses: determining computer data validity by applying the retrieved validation rules to the information ("In order to ensure the validity of the data entered by the worker, some or all of the fields will have an associated validation rule… for performing one or more tests or comparisons on data in one or more fields to make sure the data is valid…The validation rules are loaded …and validation rules associated with fields in the rules file are associated …with the corresponding field names in the MPA. The validation rules test the contents of each field entered by the user to ensure that the field is filled out correctly," col. 2 lines 24-40).

Per claim 2:

The rejection of claim 1 is incorporated, and further, Lee discloses highlighting

information determined to be invalid by the inheritable validation rules (see Fig 14) .

Per claim 3:

The rejection of claim 1 is incorporated, and further, Lee discloses that the inheritable

validation rules are provided to a client ("Once created, the validation rules are translated

to a rules file 16 (see FIG. 2) and communicated via a wireless network 20 to a mobile

computer 30 for use in validating the data entries made by a mobile worker to an

associated form," col. 4 lines 27-41) .

Per claim 4:

The rejection of claim 1 is incorporated, and further, Lee discloses that the inheritable

validation rules are provided to a server ("Once created, the validation rules are translated

to a rules file 16 (see FIG. 2) and communicated via a wireless network 20 to a mobile

computer 30 for use in validating the data entries made by a mobile worker to an

associated form," col. 4 lines 27-41) .

Per claim 5:

The rejection of claim 1 is incorporated, and further, Lee discloses that the inheritable

validation rules are imbedded into a web page ("a set of validation rules for validating

data entries made to service provider forms," col. 4 lines 28-41) .

Per claim 6:

The rejection of claim 1 is incorporated, and further, Lee discloses that the inheritable validation rules are executable both on a client and server ("Once created, the validation rules are translated to a rules file 16 (see FIG. 2) and communicated via a wireless network 20 to a mobile computer 30 for use in validating the data entries made by a mobile worker to an associated form," col. 4 lines 27-41) .

Per claims 7-12, they are the system versions of claims 1-6, respectively, and are rejected for the same reasons set forth in connection with the rejection of claims 1-6 above.

Per claims 13-18, they are the computer executable software code versions of claims 1-6, respectively, and are rejected for the same reasons set forth in connection with the rejection of claims 1-6 above.

Per claims 19-24, they are the apparatus versions of claims 1-6, respectively, and are rejected for the same reasons set forth in connection with the rejection of claims 1-6 above.

Per claim 25:

Lee discloses identifying data types requiring validation ("Sets of validation rules are created for a form interactively, by selecting fields, adding appropriate validation rules to be implemented for the fields, and adding appropriate expressions for the validation rules," col. 3 lines 19-40).

Lee does not explicitly teach identifying a retriever's input analysis capability. Nugent teaches it was known in the pertinent art, at the time applicant's invention was made, to detect the browser compatibility (i.e. JavaScript 1.2 supports regular expression

and provides common object detection routines such as window.RegExp that detects the browser compatibility). It would have been obvious for one having ordinary skill in the art to modify Lee's disclosed system to incorporate the teachings of Nugent. The modification would be obvious because one having ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to identify the retriever's browser compatibility.

Lee in view of Nugent further discloses providing customizable validation rules stored in a memory device for the associated data types (i.e. col. 3 lines 19-40; col. 4 lines 27-41) Lee does not explicitly teach customizable inheritable validation rules appropriate for a retriever's input analysis capabilities from a hereditary rules library. Brooke teaches it was known in the pertinent art, at the time applicant's invention was made, to extend and reuse the validation rules (i.e. col. 13 lines 15-25). It would have been obvious for one having ordinary skill in the art to modify Lee's disclosed system to incorporate the teachings of Brooke. The modification would be obvious because one having ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to reuse validation logic with very little code by using inheritance as taught by Brooke.

Per claim 26:

The rejection of claim 25 is incorporated, and further, Lee discloses that the inheritable validation rules are provided to a client ("Once created, the validation rules are translated to a rules file 16 (see FIG. 2) and communicated via a wireless network 20 to a mobile computer 30 for use in validating the data entries made by a mobile worker to an associated form," col. 4 lines 27-41) .

Per claim 27:

The rejection of claim 25 is incorporated, and further, Lee discloses that the inheritable

validation rules are provided to a server ("Once created, the validation rules are translated

to a rules file 16 (see FIG. 2) and communicated via a wireless network 20 to a mobile

computer 30 for use in validating the data entries made by a mobile worker to an

associated form," col. 4 lines 27-41) .

Per claim 28:

The rejection of claim 25 is incorporated, and further, Lee discloses that the inheritable

validation rules are imbedded into a web page ("a set of validation rules for validating

data entries made to service provider forms," col. 4 lines 28-41) .

Per claim 29:

The rejection of claim 25 is incorporated, and further, Lee discloses that the inheritable

validation rules are executable both on a client and server ("Once created, the validation

rules are translated to a rules file 16 (see FIG. 2) and communicated via a wireless

network 20 to a mobile computer 30 for use in validating the data entries made by a

mobile worker to an associated form," col. 4 lines 27-41) .

Per claims 30-34, they are the system versions of claims 25-29, respectively, and

are rejected for the same reasons set forth in connection with the rejection of claims 25-

29 above.

Per claims 35-39, they are the computer executable software code versions of claims 25-29, respectively, and are rejected for the same reasons set forth in connection with the rejection of claims 25-29 above.

Per claims 40-44, they are the apparatus versions of claims 25-29, respectively, and are rejected for the same reasons set forth in connection with the rejection of claims 25-29 above.

Per claim 45

Lee discloses:

-providing a rules library and an initial parent rule stored in a memory device (The menu presents the expressions as expression templates, which are templates for creating and completing an expression," col. 3 lines 40-54).

Lee does not explicitly teach identifying a retriever's input analysis capability. Nugent teaches it was known in the pertinent art, at the time applicant's invention was made, to detect the browser compatibility (i.e. JavaScript 1.2 supports regular expression and provides common object detection routines such as window.RegExp that detects the browser compatibility). It would have been obvious for one having ordinary skill in the art to modify Lee's disclosed system to incorporate the teachings of Nugent. The modification would be obvious because one having ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to identify the retriever's browser compatibility.

Lee in view of Nugent further discloses building customizable validation rules (i.e. col. 3 lines 19-40; col. 4 lines 27-41) Lee does not explicitly teach customizable inheritable validation rules appropriate for a retriever's input analysis capabilities from a

hereditary rules library class hierarchy. Brooke teaches it was known in the pertinent art, at the time applicant's invention was made, to extend and reuse the validation rules (i.e. col. 13 lines 15-25). It would have been obvious for one having ordinary skill in the art to modify Lee's disclosed system to incorporate the teachings of Brooke. The modification would be obvious because one having ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to reuse validation logic with very little code by using inheritance as taught by Brooke.

Per claim 46:

The rejection of claim 45 is incorporated, and further, Lee discloses storing subclassed inheritable validation rules in the rule library ("enables a user to create a set of form validation rules…Once created, the validation rules are translated to a rules file," col. Lines 29-41) .

Per claim 47:

The rejection of claim 45 is incorporated, and further, Brooke discloses that the subclassed inheritable validation rules inherit validation logic from a parent rule (i.e. col. 13 lines 15-25).

Per claim 48:

The rejection of claim 45 is incorporated, and further, Lee discloses that the inheritable validation rules are associated with data types (Table 2, col. 11 lines 31-60) .

Per claim 49:

The rejection of claim 45 is incorporated, and further, Lee discloses that the inheritable

validation rules are imbedded into a web page ("receiving data including the input data

from the form submitted to a server," col. 2 lines 33-40) ("it is determined whether the

input data is valid using information stored in the registry," col. 2 lines 33-44)

Per claim 50:

The rejection of claim 45 is incorporated, and further, Lee discloses that the inheritable

validation rules are executable both on a client and server ("Once created, the validation

rules are translated to a rules file 16 (see FIG. 2) and communicated via a wireless

network 20 to a mobile computer 30 for use in validating the data entries made by a

mobile worker to an associated form," col. 4 lines 27-41) .

Per claims 51-56, they are the system versions of claims 45-50, respectively, and

are rejected for the same reasons set forth in connection with the rejection of claims 45-

50 above.

Per claims 57-62, they are the computer executable software code versions of

claims 45-50, respectively, and are rejected for the same reasons set forth in connection

with the rejection of claims 45-50 above.

Per claims 63-68, they are the apparatus versions of claims 45-50, respectively,

and are rejected for the same reasons set forth in connection with the rejection of claims

45-50 above.

Per claim 69:

Lee discloses:

-marking data types for associated customizable validation rules from a rules library

stored in a memory device (col. 3 lines 50-54; col. 3 lines 19-40; col. 4 lines 27-41).

Lee does not explicitly teach identifying a retriever's input analysis capability.

Nugent teaches it was known in the pertinent art, at the time applicant's invention was

made, to detect the browser compatibility (i.e. JavaScript 1.2 supports regular expression

and provides common object detection routines such as window.RegExp that detects the

browser compatibility). It would have been obvious for one having ordinary skill in the

art to modify Lee's disclosed system to incorporate the teachings of Nugent. The

modification would be obvious because one having ordinary skill in the art would be

motivated to identify the retriever's browser compatibility.

Lee in view of Nugent further discloses the customizable validation rules (i.e. col.

3 lines 19-40; col. 4 lines 27-41) Lee does not explicitly teach that the validation rules

are customizable inheritable validation rules appropriate for a retriever's input analysis

capabilities from a hereditary rules library class hierarchy. Brooke teaches it was known

in the pertinent art, at the time applicant's invention was made, to extend and reuse the

validation rules (i.e. col. 13 lines 15-25). It would have been obvious for one having

ordinary skill in the art to modify Lee's disclosed system to incorporate the teachings of

Brooke. The modification would be obvious because one having ordinary skill in the art

would be motivated to reuse validation logic with very little code by using inheritance as

taught by Brooke.

Lee in view of Nugent and Brook further discloses: providing validation marked

data types appropriate for a retriever's capabilities (col. 3 lines 50-54; col. 3 lines 19-40;

col. 4 lines 27-41).

Per claim 70:

The rejection of claim 69 is incorporated, and further, Lee discloses:

- building forms with the inheritable validation rules associated with marked data types

(col. Lines 29-41) .

Per claim 71:

The rejection of claim 69 is incorporated, and further, Lee discloses storing forms with

the inheritable validation rules associated with marked data types (col. Lines 29-41) .

Per claim 72:

The rejection of claim 69 is incorporated, and further, Lee discloses providing forms with

the inheritable validation rules associated with marked data types over a communications

network (col. Lines 29-41) .

Per claim 73:

The rejection of claim 69 is incorporated, and further, Lee discloses that the inheritable

validation rules are imbedded into a web page (col. Lines 29-41).

Per claim 74:

The rejection of claim 69 is incorporated, and further, Lee discloses that the inheritable

validation rules are executable both on a client and server (col. Lines 29-41) .

Per claims 75-80, they are the system versions of claims 69-74, respectively, and

are rejected for the same reasons set forth in connection with the rejection of claims 69-

74 above.

Per claims 81-86, they are the computer executable software code versions of

claims 69-74, respectively, and are rejected for the same reasons set forth in connection

with the rejection of claims 69-74 above.

Per claims 87-92, they are the apparatus versions of claims 69-74, respectively,

and are rejected for the same reasons set forth in connection with the rejection of claims

69-74 above.

Response to Arguments

5.   Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-92 have been considered but are

moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

6.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to INSUN KANG whose telephone number is (571)272-

3724. The examiner can normally be reached on M-R 7:30-6 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Lewis A. Bullock, Jr. can be reached on 571-272-3759. The fax phone

number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-

8300. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published

applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status

information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For

more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you

have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business

Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO

Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call

800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Insun Kang/
Examiner, Art Unit 2193